REMARKS

Status of the Claims

The final Office Action mailed April 13, 2009 noted that claims 1-18 were pending, claim 17 was withdrawn, claims 5-7 were allowed, and claims 1-4, 8-16, and 18 were rejected. Claims 1, 8, 12, 16, and 18 are amended. No claims are cancelled. New claim 19 is added. No new matter is believed to be presented.

A Request for Continued Examination is submitted herewith. It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-19 are pending and under consideration.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Office Action, on page 2, rejected claims 1-3, 8-10, 12-14, 16, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nielsen, Ryan, and Heckerman. The Office Action, on page 7, rejected claims 4, 11, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nielsen, Ryan, Heckerman, and Oliver. These rejections are respectfully traversed below.

With respect to claim 1, the Office Action, on page 5, admitted that Nielsen and Ryan do not explicitly teach "modify and synchronize a playing time period of said media other than said text media included in said spatiotemporal layout information, on the basis of said display time period of said text media set as said spatiotemporal layout information." The Office Action, also on page 5, asserted that Heckerman cures the deficiencies of Nielsen and Ryan and specifically cited column 9, lines 6-12 of Heckerman:

> Heckerman et al. teach that the recognized text with time stamps, text corpus and audio corpus are then processed by the text/audio alignment module 318 to produce a set 412 of synchronized text and audio files which are stored under control of the control module 310. The set 412 of synchronized text and audio files may take any one of a plurality of forms as will be discussed below in regard to FIGS. 8-13.

Heckerman discusses methods and apparatus for automatically generating synchronized audio and text data, from unsynchronized electronic audio and text versions of the same work, such as a literary work. Heckerman notes that silence normally is found at the ends of paragraphs and sentences, but not between words within a sentence during ordinary speech except with regard to punctuation. Thus, Heckerman makes use of silence detection in an audio file for synchronizing audio and text versions of a same work. Speech recognition is performed on an audio corpus to recognize actual words and periods of silence. Heckerman places

pointers such as a time stamp, filename, or file identifier, in a text file corresponding to detected silence in a corresponding audio file for purposes of file synchronization. Thus, a user can switch between audio and text versions of the literary work. (See Heckerman, column 1, lines 43-45, column 3, lines 5-10, 25-36, 54-60, column 4, lines 20-27).

In light of the above discussion, it is respectfully submitted that Heckerman does not cure the admitted deficiencies of Nielsen and Ryan. In fact, Heckerman discusses modifying a text file based on an audio file, which is diametrically opposed to distinguishing features of claim 1. While Heckerman is related to modifying text based on its audio counterpart, claim 1 distinguishes over Heckerman, Nielsen, and Ryan by modifying a playing time period of other media based on display time period of text media.

In other words, Heckerman merely modifies a text file based on an audio file by using instances of silence in an audio file, and is unrelated to "modify and synchronize a playing time period of said media other than said text media...**responsive to said display time period of said text media**," recited in claim 1. In other words, a playing time period of media other than text media is synchronized to display for the duration of the time it takes to display related text media. Although text may display in sync with other media such as video on a larger display, due to limited display space on a smaller display, the text may likely take a longer time to display on a smaller screen and will likely be out of sync with other media. Heckerman does not contemplate solving such a problem. Heckerman merely discusses placing pointers such as time stamps in a text file to correspond with detected silence found in an audio version of the text file. Heckerman is entirely silent regarding synchronization of media other than text based on "display time period of said text media." Heckerman only discusses synchronization of a text file with an audio version of the text file by adding pointers to the text file corresponding to silence in the audio version. Stated another way, Heckerman is unrelated to modifying and synchronizing a playing time of media other than text media based on "display time period of said text media" but rather places pointers in a text file which correspond to instances of silence in an analogous audio file.

Thus, Heckerman in combination with Nielsen and Ryan do not teach "**modify and synchronize a playing time period of said media other than said text media** included in said spatiotemporal layout information, **responsive to said display time period of said text media**," recited in claim 1.

Independent claim 8 patentably distinguishes over Nielsen, Ryan, and Heckerman, taken alone and in combination for reasons similar to those discussed above, because nothing cited or

found discusses "a playing time period of said media other than said text media included in said spatiotemporal layout information is **modified and synchronized responsive to said display time period of said text media** set as said spatiotemporal layout information."

Independent claim 12 patentably distinguishes over Nielsen, Ryan, and Heckerman, taken alone and in combination for reasons similar to those discussed above, because nothing cited or found discusses "a playing time period of said media other than said text media included in said spatiotemporal layout information is **modified and synchronized responsive to said display time period of said text media** set as the spatiotemporal layout information."

Independent claim 16 patentably distinguishes over Nielsen, Ryan, and Heckerman, taken alone and in combination, because nothing cited or found discusses "converting input multimedia contents, including text media and media other than said text media, oriented to a personal computer to be displayed on a screen with a predetermined size into output multimedia contents oriented to a portable terminal to be displayed on a screen smaller than said predetermined size **based on a difference between a first display time period of the text media on the computer having the screen with the predetermined size and a second display time period of the text media on the screen smaller than said predetermined size**."

Claim 18 patentably distinguishes over Nielsen, Ryan, and Heckerman, because nothing cited or found discusses "modifying and synchronizing a playing time period of audio and video media in consideration with a calculated display time period of a scrolling text media as playing time information." The Office Action does not specifically reject claim 18 which recites differently from claims 1, 8, and 12 discussed above. The failure to adequately articulate the basis for rejecting a claim is a failure to provide the adequate notice that shifts the burden of rebuttal to the applicant. Because claim 18 does not have a specifically articulated basis for rejection, applicant cannot appropriately respond and clarification is requested in the next Office Action. Moreover, nothing found in Heckerman discusses "modifying and synchronizing a playing time period of audio and video" based on "a calculated display time period of a scrolling text media as playing time information."

Furthermore, claim 18 distinguishes over Nielsen, Ryan, and Heckerman, because nothing found discusses "converting...based on a difference between a first display time period of the text media on the screen of the personal computer and a second display time period of the text media on the screen of the portable device."

The dependent claims depend from the above-discussed independent claims and are patentable over the cited references for the reasons discussed above. The dependent claims

also recite additional features not taught or suggested by the cited references. For example, claim 4 recites "a repeat count setting processing unit for setting a repeat count of said media other than said text media on the basis of said display time period of said text media calculated in said text display time calculation processing unit and said total playing time period of all said segments of said media other than said text media." The Office Action, on page 4, asserted that Oliver and its <embed> tag teaches the above features. However, Oliver does not discuss "setting a repeat count based on **display time period of said text media**." In other words, Oliver does not discuss setting a repeat count based on the time it takes to display text on display, so that other media repeats if the text takes longer to scroll on a smaller display. Oliver merely discusses displaying a video when a web page loads and continuing to repeat the video as long as the web page is displayed. It is submitted that the dependent claims are independently patentable over the cited references.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

New Claim 19

It is respectfully submitted that nothing cited or found in the cited references, taken alone and in combination, discusses "lengthening, by a computer, a display time period of video media to be displayed on a first smaller display based on a text scroll display time period which is longer in duration on the first smaller display than on a second larger display," recited in claim 19.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Office Action, on page 9, noted that claims 5-7 are allowed.

Summary

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: _9-14-09_   By: _John R. Bednarz_

John R. Bednarz
Registration No. 62,168

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501